IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

TOP OF A DIVINITION OF THE STATE OF THE STAT	1
JOE CLARK MITCHELL))
Petitioner) No. 1:93-0073
V	No. 1:93-0073) Judge Haynes The resident is
IAMEG PODENED IAI) sealing 6
JAMES FORTNER, Warden) merse parly
Respondent	(a RAN Tan only to true up tent
MOTION FOR STATU	US CONFERENCE AND/OR Trut, The
	BRIEFING SCHEDULE parties full full
The Court has scheduled an eviden	ntiary hearing on Mitchell's Martinez issues for
November 18, 2013. This day, Mitchell has filed the deposition testimony of post-conviction	
counsel, Daniel J. Runde, in lieu of Mr. Ru	unde's live testimony in this matter. As Mitchell fur
has explained in his simultaneous notice of filing, the use of Mr. Runde's deposition	
testimony as his testimony in this matter	er will save both time and effort, and conserve 1/2013
judicial resources.	with any
	Response
With Mr. Runde's testimony now be	eing before this Court, it does not appear that Joe
Mitchell will need to put on any additiona	al proof at an evidentiary hearing. Mr. Runde's
testimony provides the evidence necessary	ry to assess the effectiveness of post-conviction 2013.
counsel under Martinez v. Ryan, 566 U.S. 1	1 (2012). In earlier court proceedings, witnesses
(such as trial counsel) have already provided	d testimony concerning counsel's ineffectiveness /٥-3/-/3
in failing to make a Batson objection at	trial, which is likewise relevant to Mitchell's

That being said, it now appears that the Court has before it the evidence necessary to decide Mitchell's ineffectiveness claims on the merits. The parties, however, now need

entitlement to relief under Martinez.